

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_117299
Title of the Manuscript:	GAS CHROMATOGRAPHY-FLAME IONIZATION DETECTION ASSESSMENT OF PHYTOCHEMICAL CONSTITUENTS OF CNIDOSCOLUS ACONITIFOLIUS LEAVES EXTRACTS
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://journalajrb.com/index.php/AJRB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is informative with respect to the phytochemicals identification and quantitation in the Cnidoscopus aconitifolius plant extract, which may be useful for further synthesis.</p> <p>2. Title of the manuscript should be changed as corrected in the manuscript copy.</p> <p>3. The abstract found to be comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Sections and structure of manuscript found to be appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The provided references in the manuscript are appropriate.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript is informative and can be recommended for publication provided there are major changes.</p> <p>1. Title of manuscript should be modified as commented in the manuscript correction copy</p> <p>2. Minor editorial changes in the abstract to be corrected</p> <p>3. Major corrections in the Materials and methods section (corrected in the manuscript), also required to specify some of the information as commented in the manuscript.</p> <p>4. Required to specify some of the information in the Results and Discussion section as commented in the manuscript.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ramakrishna Reddy H
Department, University & Country	India